

SEC. 13. REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may promulgate such regulations as are necessary to implement this title.

(b) PROCEDURE.—The promulgation of the regulations and administration of this subtitle shall be made without regard to—

(1) the notice and comment provisions of section 553 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) the Statement of Policy of the Secretary of Agriculture effective July 24, 1971 (36 Fed. Reg. 13804), relating to notices of proposed rulemaking and public participation in rulemaking; and

(3) chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the "Paperwork Reduction Act").

(c) CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall use the authority provided under section 808 of title 5, United States Code.

SA 2722. Mr. ALLARD (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. ALLEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 622, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the adoption credit, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PERMANENT EXTENSION OF RESEARCH CREDIT; INCREASE IN RATES OF ALTERNATIVE INCREMENTAL CREDIT.

(a) PERMANENT EXTENSION OF RESEARCH CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 41 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to credit for increasing research activities) is amended by striking subsection (h).

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (1) of section 45C(b) of such Code is amended by striking subparagraph (D).

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to amounts paid or incurred after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) INCREASE IN RATES OF ALTERNATIVE INCREMENTAL CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 41(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to election of alternative incremental credit) is amended—

(A) by striking "2.65 percent" and inserting "3 percent",

(B) by striking "3.2 percent" and inserting "4 percent", and

(C) by striking "3.75 percent" and inserting "5 percent".

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak in morning business for more than 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JEFFORDS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUGAR. I thank the Chair.

NATO'S ROLE IN THE WAR ON TERRORISM

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I enjoyed the opportunity last week in Brussels, Belgium, to address the permanent representatives to the North Atlantic

Treaty Organization, NATO, on the subject of the Alliance's forthcoming summit in Prague next November, as well as the likely agenda that will include the issues of NATO enlargement and Russia-NATO cooperation.

Perhaps more importantly, I was asked to consider and discuss with the Ambassadors of NATO the Alliance's future 3, 5, and 10 years out and to assess the impact of the events of September 11 and the consequent war on terrorism with the future role of NATO. These are the comments I made on that occasion.

There are moments in history when world events suddenly allow us to see the challenges facing our societies with a degree of clarity previously unimaginable. The events of September 11 have created one of those rare moments. We can see clearly the challenges we face and now confront and what needs to be done.

September 11 forced Americans to recognize that the United States is exposed to an existential threat from terrorism and the possible use of weapons of mass destruction by terrorists. Meeting that threat is the premier security challenge of our time. There is a clear and present danger that terrorists will gain the capability to carry out catastrophic attacks on Europe and the United States using nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons.

In 1996, I made, the Chair will recall, an unsuccessful bid for the Presidency of the United States. Three of my campaign television ads on that occasion, widely criticized for being farfetched and grossly alarming, depicted a mushroom cloud and warned of the existential threat posed by the growing dangers of weapons of mass destruction in the hands of terrorist groups. I argued that the next President should be selected on the basis of being able to meet that challenge.

Recently, those ads have been replayed on national television and are viewed from a different perspective. The images of those planes crashing into the World Trade Center on September 11 will remain with us all for some time to come. We might not have been able to prevent the attacks of September 11, but we can draw the right lessons from those events now, and one of those lessons is just how vulnerable our societies are to such attacks.

September 11 has destroyed many myths. One of those was the belief that the West was no longer threatened after the collapse of communism and our victory in the cold war, and perhaps nowhere was that myth stronger than in the United States where many Americans believed that America's strength made us invulnerable. We know now we are all vulnerable—Americans and Europeans.

The terrorists seek massive impact through indiscriminate killing of people and destruction of institutions, historical symbols, and the basic fabric of our societies. The next attack, how-

ever, could just as easily be in London, Paris, or Berlin as in Washington, and it could, or is even likely to, involve weapons or materials of mass destruction.

The sober reality is that the danger of Americans and Europeans being killed today at work or at home is perhaps greater than at any time in recent history. Indeed, the threat we face today may be just as existential as the one we faced during the cold war since it is increasingly likely to involve the use of weapons of mass destruction against our societies.

We are again at one of those moments when we must look in the mirror and ask ourselves whether we as leaders are prepared to draw the right conclusions and do what we can now to reduce that threat or whether it will take another, even deadlier, attack to force us into action.

Each of us recognizes that the war against terrorism and weapons of mass destruction must be fought on many fronts—at home and abroad—and it must be fought with many tools—political, economic, and military.

President Bush is seeking to lead a global coalition in a global war to root out terrorist cells and stop nation states from harboring terrorists.

The flip side of this policy is one that I have spent a lot of time thinking about; namely, the urgent need to extend the war on terrorism to nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons. Al-Qaida-like terrorists will use NBC weapons if they can obtain them.

Our task can be succinctly stated: Together we must keep the world's most dangerous technologies out of the hands of the world's most dangerous people. The events of September 11 and the subsequent public discovery of al-Qaida's methods, capabilities, and intentions have finally brought the vulnerability of our countries to the forefront.

The terrorists have demonstrated suicidal tendencies and are beyond deterrence. We must anticipate they will use weapons of mass destruction in NATO countries if allowed that opportunity.

Without oversimplifying the motivations of terrorists in the past, it appears that most acts of terror attempted to bring about change in a regime or change in governance or status in a community or state.

Usually, the terrorists made demands that could be negotiated or accommodated. The targets were selected to create and increase pressure for change.

In contrast, the al-Qaida terrorist attacks on the United States were planned to kill thousands of people indiscriminately. There were no demands for change or negotiation. Osama bin Laden was filmed conversing about results of the attack which exceeded his earlier predictions of destruction. Massive destruction of institutions, wealth, national morale, and innocent people was clearly his objective.

Over 3,000 people from a host of countries perished. Recent economic estimates indicate \$60 billion of loss to the